

REMARKS

The Office Action mailed May 23, 2008 (hereinafter "Office Action"), rejected Claims 1, 8-10, 24, 27, 28, 36, 42, and 45-50 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable based on the teachings of U.S. Patent No. 6,023,679 ("Acebo et al.") in view of the teachings of U.S. Patent No. 7,177,825 ("Borders et al."). Claims 2-7, 11, 12, 34, 35, and 44 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable in view of the teachings of Acebo et al., Borders et al., and further in view of the teachings of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0082877 (hereinafter "Schiff et al."). Claims 13, 29, and 43 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable based on the teachings of Acebo et al., Borders et al., and further in view of the teachings of U.S. Patent No. 6,094,640 ("Goheen"). Claims 14-17 and 51 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable based on the teachings of Acebo et al., Borders et al., Goheen, and further in view of the teachings of U.S. Patent No. 5,953,706 (hereinafter "Patel").

Claims 18, 19, and 21-23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable based on the teachings of Acebo et al., Borders et al., and Patel. Claims 30-33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable based on the teachings of Acebo et al., Borders et al., Goheen, and Patel. Claim 20 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable based on the teachings of Acebo et al., Borders et al., Patel, and Schiff et al. Claims 37-41, 56-58, 60, and 61 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable based on the teachings of Acebo et al., Borders et al., and further in view of the teachings of U.S. Patent No. 6,926,203 ("Sehr"). Claim 59 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable based on the teachings of Acebo et al., Borders et al., Sehr, and Patel. Claims 52, 53, and 55 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable based on the teachings of Acebo et al., Borders et al., Patel, Goheen, and Sehr.

LAW OFFICES OF
CHRISTENSEN O'CONNOR JOHNSON KINDNESS^{LLC}
1420 Fifth Avenue
Suite 2800
Seattle, Washington 98101
206.682.8100

While applicants do not entirely agree with the Office, in order to advance the prosecution of the current application, independent Claims 1, 27, 42, and 50 have been amended. Applicants are unable to find, and the Office has failed to show, where the cited and applied references teach or suggest,

processing concurrently, on the computing device, the multiple requests for reservation using the reservation transaction records, reservation items records, and reservation inventory records by adding records in a hold table to contain at least one inventory item data taken from the one or more reservation inventory records so as to temporarily remove from inventory without being reserved hence avoiding reservation of a same instance of the specific inventory item,

as recited by Claims 1, 27, 42, and 50, albeit in different manners. Thus, the Office has failed to state a *prima facie* case of obviousness.

The Office has sought to combine Acebo et al., Borders et al., Schiff et al., Goheen, Patel, and Sehr, in various combinations, all of which applicants specifically deny. None of the cited and applied references in any combination cures the defects of the others, and therefore, there is no benefit to the various combinations. Thus, a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established by the Office.

Because a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established by the Office, the rejections must be withdrawn. Independent Claims 1, 27, 42, and 50 are clearly patentably distinguishable over the cited and applied references. Claims 2-16, 18-24, 28-41, 43-49, and 51-61 are allowable because they depend from allowable independent claims and because of

the additional limitations added by those claims. Consequently, reconsideration and allowance of Claims 1-24 and 27-61 is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

CHRISTENSEN O'CONNOR
JOHNSON KINDNESS^{PLLC}

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'D.C. Peter Chu', written over the printed name of the law firm.

D.C. Peter Chu
Registration No. 41,676
Direct Dial No. 206.695.1636

DPC/VXR:md/mgp/ejh/jlg

LAW OFFICES OF
CHRISTENSEN O'CONNOR JOHNSON KINDNESS^{PLLC}
1420 Fifth Avenue
Suite 2800
Seattle, Washington 98101
206.682.8100